

**REMARKS****Claims Objections**

The objection to claim 22 has been addressed by amendments in accordance with the Examiner's proposal.

The status identifier of claim 27 has been corrected to be "Previously Presented" so as to address the claim objection.

**Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112**

As regards the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that the term "measuring the time interval for transmission of a test signal" is not new matter but is fully supported by the terms "performing a delay measurement" and "performing delay measurements" in the application as filed. It will be recalled that the claims were amended to address the Examiner's objection that the phase "performing a delay measurement" was vague and indefinite. In fact, that phase is not vague and indefinite, but, in the context of the present invention, relating as it does to testing of integrated circuits, is clear and definite and fully co-terminus with the revised term: "measuring a time interval for transmission of a test signal". The term "performing a delay measurement" means performing a measurement of time delay. What can experience a time delay through an integrated circuit? – The answer is a signal. How is delay measured? – The answer is by applying a test data signal (see e.g. present application page 10 line 15 which talks of a test data input) then measuring the time delay before the signal reaches the output, in other words "measuring the time interval for transmission of the test signal ... to the output".

In summary, there is no new matter here, just a relatively minor change of terminology. It follows that independent claims 22 and 26, and also dependent claims 23 to 25 and 27 to 28, comply with the written description requirement.

As regards the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, claim 22 line 1 has been amended to provide appropriate antecedent basis. Furthermore, it is

respectfully submitted that the terms "in a first period" and "at other times" are not indefinite but are definite and clear. The two terms would be read in juxtaposition such that "in a first period" (when something is required), is in clear contrast to "at other times" (when something else is required). Although it is clear albeit implicit in the rejected claim 22, that the "other times" are - - other times than the first time period --, this has now been made explicit in amended claim 22.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the present claims should be examined on their merits, and when so examined will be found acceptable.

Dependent Claims

Claims 23 to 28 are patentable not least on the basis that they each depend on an allowable independent claim 22.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 973-386-3147.

Respectfully submitted,

**Josef Schmid**

By:   
**M. I. Finston, Attorney**  
**Reg. No. 31613**

Date: 7-17-06

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)  
Lucent Technologies Inc.  
101 Crawfords Corner Road  
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030